

Appl. No. 09/456,897

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of 13 August 2003. Claims 16-33 are pending in the application, Claims 16-26 have been rejected, and Claims 27-33 have been withdrawn from consideration.

By this amendment, Claim 26 has been amended, in a non-narrowing manner, to correct a grammatical error; and arguments are presented which traverse both the restriction requirement and the rejection of the Claims.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments above and remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination.

About The Invention

The present invention relates generally to electronic documents, and more particularly relates to production and display of electronic documents in which text and script portions are exclusive from each other (i.e., segregated), and in which the script portion includes location dependent parameter identifiers along with location coordinates, which, together, direct various effects of the script to the specified location. In one further aspect of the present invention, the script portion (which excludes text, and includes location parameters) directs replacement of one or more elements of the text portion with predetermined other elements. In another further aspect of the present invention, the script portion and text portion are communicated, or transmitted, separately.

Restriction Requirement

Applicant respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction made by the Examiner in the Office Action of 13 August 2003; and requests that this requirement be withdrawn and that Claims 27-33 be considered. Applicant further traverses the assertion that an election has been made by presentation of the originally filed Claims which precludes the consideration of Claims 27-33.

Appl. No. 09/456,897

The Examiner states that Claims 16-26 are drawn to a method for producing and rendering an electronic document, whereas Claims 27-33 are drawn to a method for encoding or converting an electronic document from the parsing of an element of an input document. The Examiner further states that since Applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected; resulting in a conclusion that Claims 27-33 are directed to a non-elected invention.

Applicant respectfully notes that the "encoding" referred to in the Claims is that which produces segregated text and script in accordance with the present invention. Applicant further notes that originally presented Claims 1-15, did indeed relate to an "encoding", and therefore originally presented Claims 1-15 cannot act as an election that precludes the consideration of Claims 27-33. More particularly, originally presented independent Claim 1 was drawn to a method of enabling an encoding of an electronic document; and originally presented independent Claim 5 was drawn to an encoder for encoding an electronic document.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the requirement for restriction should be withdrawn, and requests that withdrawn Claims 27-33 be considered on the merits.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 16-26 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Freund, Jim ("HotDog Professional 5.1 Webmaster Suite: HotDog 5.1 Cuts the Mustard", 11/1998, Computer Shopper, Vol. 18, No. 11, pages 1-2) in view of Business Wire, "HotDog powers Web authors to new heights", 10/1996, pages 1-2), and in further view of Powers, et al., (US Patent 6,363,817).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 16-26, and requests that these rejections be withdrawn. For at least the reasons set forth below, the cited references, either singularly or in combination, do not

Appl. No. 09/456,897

disclose, suggest, or provide motivation, for the invention defined by the Claims.

Claims 16-33 are directed to various aspects of the present invention including providing separate text and script portions, each of those portions being exclusive of the other; and the script portion including at least one location dependent parameter identifier. Prior art operators such as INPUT and TEXTAREA were in-line, or integrated with, the text portions upon which they operated. The segregated text portions can then be displayed by display applications, such as for example, text editors and email programs, that were not adapted to process the control information that script languages provide. Since the Claimed invention segregates such operators from the text to which they apply, it is necessary to modify the original scripts and introduce location coordinates therein so that a display application capable of interpreting the script commands can be provided with the information as to where in the text to apply the operation. Operators such as, but not limited to, INPUT and TEXTAREA are associated with location coordinates in the Claimed invention, and are referred to as location dependent parameter identifiers.

The Freund and Business Wire references to the HotDog web page development software simply do not disclose the segregation of text and script as recited in the Claims. The Freund reference discloses an HTML editor and the display of a web page. The Business Wire reference discloses an HTML editor and the use of Java Script. Neither reference, alone or in combination, produces the claimed invention, which requires a text portion exclusive of script, and a script portion exclusive of text, and the script further including location dependent parameter identifiers. Furthermore, there is no motivation in these references to produce Applicant's claimed invention. Both Freund and Business Wire provide disclosures in the context of an HTML editor. Applicant's invention addresses the problems faced by application programs such as e-mail programs or text processors, which were designed for text messages, and not for the processing of control messages such as scripts. In other words, an HTML editor inherently does not have the problem which Applicant's claimed invention solves. Therefore it is understandable

Appl. No. 09/456,897

why the articles about HTML editors do not provide motivation for Applicant's claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 16 is not obvious in view of the cited references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-26, which depend directly or indirectly from Claim 16, are also unobvious in view of the cited references.

Conclusion

All of the rejections in the outstanding Office Action of 13 August 2003 have been responded to, and Applicants respectfully submit that the pending Claims 16-26 are in condition for allowance and that Claims 27-33 are entitled to receive an action on the merits.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By Raymond J. Werner
Raymond J. Werner
Reg. No. 34,752

Dated: 23 September 2003
Portland, Oregon

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 24 2003

OFFICIAL